

Notes

Disturbance Monitoring SDT — Project 2007-11

February 2, 2010 | 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. EST

February 3, 2010 | 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. EST

Dial-in Numbers: 866.740.1260 | Access Code: 6088084

1. Administrative

1.1. Roll Call

Stephanie Monzon conducted roll call. Those present are listed below:

- **Navin B. Bhatt** — **American Electric Power (Chair)**
- Tracy M. Lynd — Consumers Energy Co. (phone)
- James R. Detweiler — FirstEnergy Corp. (phone)
- *Barry G. Goodpaster* — *Exelon Business Services Company – retired from DM SDT*
- Steven Myers — Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc.
- Jeffrey M. Pond — National Grid
- Jack Soehren — ITC Holdings (phone)
- Stephanie Monzon — North American Electric Reliability Corporation
- Alan D. Baker — Florida Power & Light Company
- Daniel J. Hansen — RRI Energy, Inc.
- Charles Jensen – JEA
- Larry E. Smith — Alabama Power Company
- Felix Amarh — Georgia Transmission Corporation (phone)
- Willy Haffecke — Springfield Missouri City Utilities

Observers:

- Richard Ferner — WAPA (phone)
- Anthony Jablonski – ReliabilityFirst Corporation
- Sherry Goiffon – Oncor
- Greg Bradley – APP Engineering
- Danny Johnson – FERC
- Laura Zotter – ERCOT

2. **NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines**

Stephanie Monzon reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines with the group.

3. **Status of the Overall DM SDT project**

Navin indicated that this is being added to the agenda because he is concerned with the status of the project. He suggested that we discuss after the MVA update. In particular, he has concerns with the issues that have been discussed and not resolved. These issues include locations, FAQ, technical paper – if so, what is being included?, exemptions for DDR, criteria (number of elements/MVA), high side of GSU, etc. There are many loose ends that need to be discussed and resolved. Navin suggested that we track all the action items in a separate file to be distributed and tracked on a regular basis.

Navin suggested looking at the project schedule and the DM roster.

Stephanie created a separate issues tracking document that will be used to track all open technical and process related issues and action items. This document will also be used to memorialize all technical decisions made related to the standard.

4. **MVA Task Team Update—Chuck Jensen**

Chuck Jensen will provide an update on the task team's progress on data collection and analysis.

The team is working to pull together working models for the regions that they have data for. This model would allow the group to apply the 10,000 MVA criteria and provide "answers" regarding what is included in the model (size generators, etc.). It looks like the five/three line criteria in the first posting yields results not far off the 10,000 MVA criteria. This initial finding is based on the data received from the various regions such as Texas, FRCC, etc. The 10,000 MVA criteria include important 138kV elements that the first posting criteria excluded (200 kV threshold).

Felix reported that he is conducting analysis the correlates number of lines and MVA or vice versa. This information will allow the team to establish the appropriate level of coverage for DME.

Navin asked Chuck what additional support is needed for the data analysis. Felix and Chuck are creating the models. Bob C. and Phil T. are providing support but are not actively performing analysis. They are focused on researching past disturbances. The team is also looking at filling in data gaps. The MVA team is meeting after the DM SDT meeting to review FRCC data and fill in data gaps. Navin asked the group to clarify if generating units are included in the analysis – Felix and Chuck indicated that GSUs are included (not single units).

Data received thus far is from Florida, Michigan, Texas, Ohio, Chicago, WAPA (short circuit data only), New York (short circuit only) and New England (short circuit only), Pennsylvania, New Jersey.

Southern California, AEP, MRO, and NPCC data would facilitate the data analysis.

The team updated the overall project schedule based on the estimate provided by Chuck. There will be analysis results in the April timeframe. The team will work to revise the criteria requirements based on analysis results (using the data the team has today) by June 1, 2010. The additional data being collected for the areas identified above will be incorporated into the third version of the standard.

5. **Review of DM Standard**

5.1. General Format — Dan H. will provide an overview of a reformatting recommendation proposed by a sub-team of the SDT. This was not discussed at the face-to-face meeting due to time constraints.

5.2. Review of embedded comments in standard – The drafting team will discuss the issues marked within the standard as a result of the comments on the first posting. The group walked through the definitions and the DDR requirements.

5.3. Review of DDR requirements

5.3.1. The team (all on the phone and present in the meeting) with the exception of Willy H. (not present) and Steve Myers (not present) agreed to look at the NPCC/RFC approach to defining DDR requirements.

5.3.2. The team revised the DDR requirements. The DDR location requirements will be established by a group of Planning Coordinators (concept taken from the UFLS SDT) through system studies and historical events.

6. **Definition of “Sites” or “Lines”**

The team did not discuss this agenda item due to time constraints.

The team will determine if they will adopt the MVA preamble language for lines to help clarify the standard. The following is what is contained in the MVA preamble:

Line Count

1. Utilize Electric Grid Transmission One-Lines
2. Regardless of ownership, lines entering and leaving a location are typically crossing a perimeter and should be counted as they cross the location’s perimeter.
3. Do include the number of tie lines to remote interconnect locations.
4. Do not count radial lines.
5. Do not count a line from a location to a generator step-up transformer for a generator and within the same ground grid. This line is associated with the generator connection ONLY.

6. Do not count lines connecting two different voltage level buses, interconnected with an autotransformer, and within the same ground grid. The lines used to interconnect the autotransformers are associated with the autotransformer connection ONLY.

7. Establish Plan for FAQ Document

The team will step through the RFC FAQ document as a starting point for their FAQ document.

The team did not cover this agenda item.

8. Consideration of Comments

The team will continue to work through the consideration of comments process at Question 10 AEP (stopping point at the Jan. 2010 conference call).

The team decided to set up additional conference calls to continue walking through the response to comments.

9. Action Items—captured now in a separate tracking sheet.

10. Establish 2010 Schedule (all times – eastern time)

Date and Time	Location	Comments
January 11, 2010 2-4 pm eastern	web-conference	Questions 10, 13, 18 Questions 11-12 Questions 16-17
February 2 -3, 2010 8-5 pm (both days)	In Person Meeting	Juno, FL
February 22, 2010 2-4 pm (both days)	web-conference	Questions 10, 13, 18 Questions 11-12 Questions 16-17
March 9, 2010 2-4 pm (both days)	web-conference	
March 25, 2010 2-4 pm (both days)	web-conference	
April 5, 2010 2-4 pm (both days)	web-conference	
April 22, 2010 2-4 pm (both days)	web-conference	

May 5-6, 2010 8-5 pm (both days)	In Person Meeting	Tentative Atlanta, GA
-------------------------------------	-------------------	-----------------------

11. **Review Project Schedule**—reviewed (see agenda item 2)

12. **Adjourn**

Attachment 1 Antitrust Guidelines

I. General

It is NERC's policy and practice to obey the antitrust laws and to avoid all conduct that unreasonably restrains competition. This policy requires the avoidance of any conduct that violates, or that might appear to violate, the antitrust laws. Among other things, the antitrust laws forbid any agreement between or among competitors regarding prices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that unreasonably restrains competition.

It is the responsibility of every NERC participant and employee who may in any way affect NERC's compliance with the antitrust laws to carry out this commitment.